DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 275 893 CE 045 505

AUTHOR Herrin, Donald A.
TITLE The Uniqueness of Home Economics and Its Conversation with Itself. A Response to Papers by Patricia J. Thompson, Francine H. Hultgren, Maureen E. Kelly, and Linda B. Peterat.
PUB DATE 18 Apr 86
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Research; *Feminism; *Home Economics; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Postsecondary Education; Secondary Education; *Womens Education; *Womens Studies

ABSTRACT

Recent discussions have questioned the ongoing contributions of home economics to conversations about women's education. These conversations are complicated by factors suggesting home economics is a discipline that talks primarily to itself but sees itself having a unique view of the world that takes women's world of experience as its starting point. Many other women, particularly feminists, disagree. This disagreement is due to different perspectives concerning the uniqueness of home economics's view, limited accessibility of its relevant scholarship, and the failure of home economics and feminism to have seen and articulated an alternative work view based upon women's experience. Underneath both areas is a fundamental dependence on an ontology of self versus other. An alternative ontology is suggested that assumes the interconnection of self with other. A different view of the world is constructed that locates the study and conceptualization of the home and family in a context that takes women's ongoing caring responsibilities as its organizing principle. In this context of embedded and interconnected relationships between the family, the home, and the workplace, living is typified by interruption, discontinuity, lack of completion, and a constant juggling of attention to other individuals. This unique view is not a part of current educational conversations but should be. An appendix lists 26 resources that offer areas for further conversation with home economists. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED275893

ANNUAL AERA CONFERENCE
SAN FRANCISCO, APRIL 18, 1986

HERSIG SYMPOSIUM SESSION

THE COMPANY AND CONVERSATION OF EDUCATED WOMEN: ARE HOME ECONOMISTS INVITED?

THE UNIQUENESS OF HOME ECONOMICS AND ITS CONVERSATION WITH ITSELF

A RESPONSE TO PAPERS BY
PATRICIA J. THOMPSON, FRANCINE H. HULTGREN,
MAUREEN E. KELLY, & LINDA B. PETERAT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D Herrin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Donald A. Herrin, Ph. D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Family and Consumer Studies
University of Utah

NOT FOR REPRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, OR PUBLICATION
WITHOUT PERMISSION OF AUTHOR

CE 034 558

THE UNIQUENESS OF HOME ECONOMICS AND ITS CONVERSATION WITH ITSELF

by

Donald A. Herrin, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Family and Consumer Studies
University of Utah

ABSTRACT

Recent discussions have questioned the ongoing contributions of Home Economics to conversations about women's education. These conversations are complicated by several factors that suggest Home Economics is a discipline that talks primarily to itself but sees itself having a unique view of the world that takes women's world of experience as its starting point. Many other women, particularly feminists, do not see Home Economics having such a view. It is argued that this disagreement is due to 1) different perspectives concerning the uniqueness of Home Economics' view; 2) its lack of scholarship in articulating its unique view; 3) the limited accessibility of its relevant scholarship; and 4) the failure of both Home Economics and much of Feminism to have actually seen and articulated an alternative world view based upon women's experience. Underneath both areas is a fundamental dependence on an ontology of self vs. other. An alternative ontology is suggested that doesn't pit the self against the other by assuming the interconnection of self with other. From this, a different view of the world is constructed that locates the study and conceptualization of the home and family in a context that takes women's ongoing caring responsibilities as its organizing principle. In this context of embedded and interconnected relationships between the family, the home, and the workplace, living is typified by interruption, discontinuity, lack of completion, and a constant juggling of attention to other individuals. This is a unique view that is not a part of current educational conversations--but should be.

THE UNIQUENESS OF HOME ECONOMICS AND ITS CONVERSATION WITH ITSELF

I am honored to to be part of this conversation, although I lament not being in your company. In keeping with Jane Roland Martin's spirit of conversation, I hope my comments will be taken as cooperative and constructive as well as necessarily critical. I know of no points of view that can be taken uncritically on their own terms. Given the messages of the papers prepared for this occasion, my impression is that home economists would categorically respond to this question of invitation with a resounding "Yes!" While I am inclined to support this invitation to Home Economists, I want to consider some of the problematic aspects of the invitation and this affirmative response later in the discussion. There are a number of reasons why I think several different responses may be more accurate for others participating in the conversation.

> **RESPONSE 1.** We're not sure of what you have to say so we're not certain we want you to join the conversation with us.

This response implies several important implications. It suggests that individuals in other disciplines have a number of unanswered questions about home economics. Where do home economists say what they have to say that would impact our fields and research? Where is the current conceptual/theoretical writing and conversation about home economics published? Where are conversations with other disciplines published? Are the relevant journals in home economics accessible? Are they referenced in the major citation and index services so research in home economics can be integrated into research in our fields?

Much has been said of the ongoing contributions of home economics to conversations about women's (and men's) education. The continuation of these conversations depends, in part, on the accessibility of home economics to those who wish to engage in dialogue concerning what it is that home economics is doing and what it continues to offer. In my mind, such dialogues should be possible in the research publications representative of home economics and home economists. Those interested in the field or in related research should be able to readily gain access to what is being said, by whom, where, and when.

I must confess that my personal experience in accessing research of interest to me in the field of home economics has been very dismal. Nothing short of looking through numerous individual issues of journals has made it possible for me to determine if they contained material that was applicable to what I was researching. Otherwise I could not cross-reference or locate the pertinent research in home economics with research in related fields of interest to me. I have always found this to be frustrating, disappointing, and have never understood how a mature and serious discipline could afford this inaccessibility. My interpretations of this have ranged from taking it to be a measure of the irrelevance of research done in the field to it being an indication of home economic's lack of interest in conversations and dialogues with others. To provide a quick demonstration of what I mean, I picked 6 journals that I thought were quite representative of home economics and 11 different

indexing services that I frequently use in literature searches and library research when I am investigating topics that I think are germane to some of the areas in home economics.

Table 1 About Here

There are approximately 8000 different journals listed in these different services and many more that are listed in a majority of these services. I was absolutely astounded at this incredible lack of listings for home economics related journals. I hope it is equally as disturbing to you. I also hope you can understand the kind of statement this makes about home economics as a discipline and how seriously it pursues theory, research, policy applications, and participation in conversations in the academic community at large. How can a field hope to be included in conversations with other disciplines when it appears to be a discipline that only talks to itself? I'm not sure that home economics even talks to itself very intelligently in comparison to other established disciplines in the social and behavioral sciences, life sciences, or the humanities. Some examples.

The commencement of publishing yearbooks by the Teacher Education Section of AHEA is a great step forward in providing quality theoretical and conceptual models, frameworks, and discussions, reviews of literature and research, and teaching suggestions and models. The materials in the yearbooks are excellent, by and large, and should be distributed as widely as possible, but their circulation is minimal. There isn't another

established discipline that I am aware of that doesn't regularly publish such materials plus book reviews and bibliographic essays on a frequent basis in at least one major flagship journal. In most cases, such flagship journals are distributed to those who pay annual membership fees in a related professional organization as part of their membership benefits.

I am appalled that a field that considers itself a mature, established, active, and enlightened discipline (1) does not have such a journal published by its national organization for its membership and interested scholars; (2) does not have a scholarly journal for theoretical and conceptual articles; and (3) has not worked harder to get home economics related journals listed in the major citation and index services. The second of these points could be achieved by creating a new journal, refocusing the direction, content, and target audience of the Journal of Home Economics, or by extending the focus and coverage of Home Economics Research Journal. [The new journal-to-be, Home Economics Forum, may help fill this gap.] The first point could be resolved by replacing the current membership journal with the new or redesigned journal obtained for point 2. Another solution to points 1 and 2 could be met by another entity or group (other than AHEA) editing and publishing such a journal in return for memberships in the alternative organization. The third point can be accomplished by contacting the different services to learn what the criteria are for getting home economics related journals listed and then meeting those criteria.

I think Dr. Kelly's discussion of the female researcher in home economics education can be construed in a different light if it is the case that much of the research published is only used, by design or default, by home economists who then end up talking only to themselves. The so-called plight of such researchers is perpetuated if they don't perceive or understand the relationship between having a unique way of viewing things and making the view accessible to academe and the subject for conversations across disciplines. They have a personal responsibility to provide new scholarship in home economics so it will be much more visible in the academic community and identified as a scholarly, knowledge producing field of study. If part of the unique view of everyday living that many home economists maintain they have is dependent on their perspective of integrating teaching and service in what they see and do in people-oriented activities as alluded to by Kelly, then that world view needs to be published and discussed in conversations. I do not forsee home economists being seen as good conversationalists if they are otherwise perceived as a group that engages in very little research and produces little scholarly work to offer to other disciplines. This scenario suggests another response to the invitation question.

> **RESPONSE 2.** It does not appear to us, given our perception of what home economics has always taught and emphasized, that you have very much to say by way of conversation with other disciplines so you're company is welcome but we do not want you to join the conversation with us. The possible exception to this response hinges on your having something to say in the 1980s that is a major departure from your past focus. If this is the case, we are unaware of it because we have not known where to find such an altered contemporary perspective.

> We are left to assume that you have nothing new to offer and that you would seek only to reify your past focus, values, and bias. So while you're company is welcome, we don't want you to join us as conversationalists.

There are also several important implications implicit in this response as well. Again it suggests that individuals in other disciplines have a number of unanswered questions about home economics as a field. Do home economists have things to say that are uniquely its own that are compelling, informative, useful, and helpful for dealing with social issues and problems that are connected with everyday living? Where is its unique perspective written and discussed? Has its uniqueness always existed in its history or is it only recently putting together what it sees to be its unique knowledge and view of everyday living? If such uniqueness does exist, why is home economics ignored? Is it because home economics, while being relevant, is invisible and therefore not perceived? Is home economics ignored even though it is visible because it is perceived as being irrelevant--as if home economists really do not have very much to write and converse about that is unique and compelling?

The answers to the implied questions intimated in **Response 2** have been briefly summarized in Barbara Miller Solomon's book <u>In the company of educated women: A history of women and higher education</u> (1985). She concludes that "home economics, household administration, and domestic science were all terms which focused on education for housewifery (p. 86)". Given most women's experience with the "stichin and sewin" focus of home economics programs as it has been and is taught in primary and secondary

schools who then move into other fields and professions, it should not be surprising to learn that home economics has been and still is perceived, by such women, as the enemy in their concerns about the integrity of women's overall education. This perception is amplified to the degree that home economics can be argued to be a field that is gender-bound, gender-biased, and gender-selective (Martin, 1985; Solomon, 1985). It is not gender-blind or gender-sensitive (Martin, 1985) as Dr. Thompson suggests it has the possibility to be in her paper and elsewhere (1984). She decribes this possibility in the following comment of home economics' contribution to a futurist gender-free view.

> In a sense, Home Economics challenges the monopoly of individual disciplines on the stock of knowledge available to humankind by looking at knowledge from a family perspective and filtering that knowledge throught a lens of analysis informed by female experience. Ultimately, the opposites of male-defined reality and female-defined reality must be synthesized in a comprehensive vision of what constitutes a worthwhile human life. Home Economics stands as the only system of knowledge established to undertake that task. (p. 341)

In a somewhat different but related context, it is also likely that home economics will continue to be perceived, by some, as racist and classist in the same ways as much of higher education is (Harding, 1985)--in spite of assertions that deny these prejudices.

> If the feminist movement was a movement for women's "liberation," it may be said that from its beginning, Home Economics has also been an emancipatory movement, but one that promotes connectiveness and caring for men as well as women. (Merrell, Hoye, & Thompson, 1984, p. 284)

These negative perceptions are likely to continue even though

home economics maintains that it has always been concerned with problems of women, families, and social inequities. The following is an example of such liberatory claims:

> Since its formal inception seventy-five years ago, the field of Home Economics has been unique: it has always affirmed the roles of women as homemakers and/or wage earners. Home Economics has consistently sought--through research and education--to address the problems of women and families in everyday living and to correct the social inequities affecting women and families through education, community service, and political action. (Bovy, 1984, p. 293)

Solomon also points out that home economics has seldom provided young women with role models in academe of anything other than well-educated single women. In more recent years as married women have found positions in higher education, women students have found role models for balancing a career and a marriage. Still largely missing however, are role models for the many young women who aspire to juggle a professional, a marriage, and the bearing and rearing of children. This suggests there are a number of factors that contribute to the absence of such role models in combining careers or vocations in home economics and everyday life. One factor with considerable historic precedent is that many of the home economists in academe are not married and are usually without children or they are married but do not usually have young children. Another factor may be that it is very difficult to juggle such a combination of activities on a day-to-day basis. Or the juggling is possible, but few do it in ways that allow the juggling of employment, family, and home activities to inform or to be made visible in their research,

teaching, and interaction with peers and students. Consequently, by overshadowing the complexity of everyday living through a preoccupation with career selection and vocational training, home economics appears to many to be offering an oversimplified view of the problems of everyday reality.

Thompson's paper and several of her recent discussions (1984, 1986) could be construed to play into this criticism about role models because of her selection of Hestia as a goddess-model for home economists. While Hestia is the goddess of the hearth, she is also the goddess least likely to be involved emotionally with a spouse, children, and friends (Bolen, 1984). Kathryn Rabuzzi (1982) also suggests that Hestia is the goddess most likely to think that everyone will "live happlily everafter". I do not think this is the image that home economics wants to make and maintain in its conversation with other disciplines.

With one camp having identified home economics as the enemy and home economists feeling they are hardly worthy of such a distinction, I think it would be useful to sort through some of these differences in perception. With **Response 1** and **Response 2** already on the record, I believe there is a more complimentary view to be had of home economists as conversationalists. I think many home economists would agree with the following response to the question of invitation.

> **RESPONSE 3.** We know home economists have many compelling things to say about the subjects of interest to us. So please come, join the conversation, and enlighten us. We all know that home economics has a history with a unique view and understanding of the everyday experience of women that is important for us to learn and apply.

All of the presented papers assert that home economics has a unique view of everyday life that has always been part of its history and heritage and that much of it is directly related to education. What is the nature of this uniqueness? Thompson, Hultgren, Kelly, and Peterat all discuss this to some degree in their respective paper's particular contexts. They all agree on the uniqueness of home economic's view of everday living in home, family, and the female world. However, I constantly found myself wanting and waiting for them to describe what they uniquely see about everyday living in home, family, and the female world. To my knowledge, descriptions or examples of such insights are not included in these papers to any substantive degree. Most descriptions were rooted in a return to the past, either couched in principles and perspectives taught in the past, or in the analyses of texts drawn from the past. I found very little of the descriptions to be informed by the authors' everyday living experience or how the descriptions might reflect the embeddedness of the authors in a uniquely female perspective.

The positive nature of **Response 3** depends on a perception of home economics as a field that has this unique view of the world that would impact the education of women. Negative opinions of this response are based largely on the belief that home economics does not have a unique and relevant view. In support of the assertion that home economics does have a unique view, the following statement captures well its essence and significance:

> A well-established tenet of feminism is that "the personal is political." This is true of Home Economics as well. The question was not whether women were uniquely suited to the domestic sphere, but **whether the domestic sphere supported the need for a unique knowledge system grounded in female experience and epistemology** [emphasis mine]. (Thompson, 1984, p. 321)

Unfortunately, so far this emphasis seems to have been used only as an epistemological consideration and therefore it fails to raise the same issue at an ontological basis. Feminists have recently raised this question at both the ontological (Whitbeck, 1984) and the epistemological (Gould, 1984; Harding & Hintikka, 1983) level. But for the most part, they have left the home and family out of their questions. And while home economists have focused on the home and family in asking the epistemological question, they have not raised the ontological question using the home, family, and female world of experience.

> The philosophical framework of Home Economics provides a means of posing knowledge questions related to everyday activities. Yet feminists and Women's Studies scholars have both contributed to the "invisibility" of Home Economics. (Thompson, 1984, p. 335)

Feminism's critique of home economics (and its invisibility) can be attributed, in part, to their failure to ask the ontological question. The critique of feminism that is often made by home economists often takes the form of the following conclusion:

> In the past, Home Economics was dismissed pejoratively as a "woman's field." Today, this should be considered a source of professional pride. It might be--were it not for the negative consequences of sexual stereotyping that continues to plague Home Economics....Part of this may involve reclaiming those parts of the Home Economics movement that were grounded in female experience and life activity and that have been rejected and repressed by many feminists. Do feminists find Home Economists threatening because--like many men--they have devalued every-

> thing traditionally associated with woman's self-defined sphere--the home? (Merrell, Hoye, & Thompson, 1984, p. 281)

Another criticism that can be made of home economics is in the way it compartmentalizes the everyday experiences of women. Home economists argue that they have good reasons for doing this, as suggested in the following quote.

> Home Economics is alone among the social science disciplines to carry, implicit in its practice (praxis), the notion of the severance of the manager-mother (as caregiver) functions--one a household function, the other a family function (p. 181)....Woman has been constrained by her domestic role and the boundaries of the female world as defined by a male-dominated patriarchal society. Home Economics has addressed this issue differently from feminism. By implicitly segmenting the managerial and the maternal functions, yet seeing them as both practically and symbolically interwoven, Home Economics has sought to free women from "oppression" by addressing these problems from the standpoint of a changing knowledge base and through the process of technology transfer to reduce household drudgery. (Costantakos, 1984, p. 191)

Dorothy Smith, a sociologist of knowledge, points out a serious problem with this practice in the context of time use studies:

> Applications of time-budget methods to comparisons between the amount of work women do in the home and the amount of work men do outside and inside the home have simply adapted the distinction between work and leisure in such a way that the kinds of responsibilities women take in relation to the home and to the children simply do not appear. The work/leisure organization applies to employment. The sociological concepts are borrowed directly from it. **If we started with housework as a basis, the categories of "work" and "leisure" would never emerge. And indeed, it is hard to imagine how, using housework as our basic framework, it would be possible to make "work" and "leisure" observable** [emphasis mine]. The organization of the role of housewife, mother, and wife does not conform to the divisions between being at work and not being at work. Even the concept of housework as work leaves what we do as mothers without a conceptual home. (Smith, 1979, p. 154)

Smith's primary concern is that this traditional way of viewing women's everyday living "produces an odd division between housework and what we do as mothers which in no way conforms to the actuality of experience (1981, p. 3)". I see this as a major flaw in both home economics' epistemology and feminism's ontology and epistemology--they all cast the nature of women's experience in the home in a way that leaves what they do as homemaker, parent, spouse, employee, invisible. The fact that such work in the home frees others up to do other things is not seen as a condition and opportunity that follows from having someone in the background on a predictably consistent basis doing particularly unique things--unique to caregiving in the home. Such services are easily taken for granted or viewed as a trap. Both feminism and home economics has missed this ontological difference.

It is compelling to me that home economics sees itself as having a unique view of the world that takes women's world of experience as its starting point and that many other women do not see home economics having such a view. I believe part of the problem is centered around home economics' lack of scholarship in articulating their unique view. Merrell, Hoye, and Thompson (1984) think the problem resides primarily within feminist circles and their not seeing the light. They have stated:

> Part of the problem--both theoretically and practically--may stem from a failure on the part of feminists to acknowledge the ideology implicit in the Home Economics Movement....As women scholars revisit the idea of women in the home and suggest alternative ways of looking at the life cycle of women, they must also revisit Home Economics. (p. 285)

But I think the major source of confusion on both sides of the matter stems from neither group actually having seen and articulated an alternative world view to the ones they are operating within now--in spite of their assertions otherwise. There is much in what they see that is still couched in masculist categories and world views. At this point in time, I see more being done in this area by a small number of researchers--mostly feminists (for a sample, see Appendix A).

One of the major characteristics of much of this work is that it is based on a different ontological and epistemological foundation. In all of the presented papers here, each of the authors utilized some form of dualism in their explanations. All utilize some variation of the private/public, nature/culture, reproductive/productive, personal/political, or Hestian/Hermean. [Thompson-Tetreault (1985) identifies this focus of study as bifocal scholarship, the third of five different phases of theory in her "Feminist Phase Theory". See Table 2 for a summary of her typology.] The dualisms discussed in the different presented papers are treated in some cases as polarities (opposites), as complementary features or traits, or as elements, traits, or characteristics that exist in some type of dialectical tension. While it is the case that these dualistic categories are useful for studying their variation over time and across cultures, they obscure the everyday living that isn't qualifiable as either/or; that may be bits and pieces of both plus a few more; and may be contradictory in some ways and compatible in other ways at the

same time and place. "Not only can the personal be political, for example, but both politics and personal life are bound up with other matters not easily classifiable either as political or as personal (Whitbeck, 1984, p. 76)."

Table 2 About Here

Underneath the dualisms referenced in these articles is the fundamental ontological base of self vs. other as opposed to the interconnection of self and other. Even such notables as Martin, Gilligan, Chodorow, Bolen, Beecher, Swallow-Richards, Bevier, Heidegger, Dilthey, and Gadamer presume a fundamental tension between the self and any other self. This is characteristic of thinking one is wearing women-focused glasses when they actually are masculist. The assumption is that looking at women is the same as looking through women-focused lens. Many nonfeminists and feminists alike wear such lens without noticing how they shape perceptions. It has only been in the last few years that anyone has constructed an ontology that doesn't pit the self against the other or other individuals. Caroline Whitbeck, a feminist philosopher, has done much to bring this ontology into visibility (1984). In this framework, an ethics of care can be articulated from the ontological interconnection and subjectivity of all people rather than the disconnection and objectivity that comes from being a self being-in-the-world or a self at odds with others. Such an ethics can then be combined and differentiated from ethics with duties, rules, and rights.

From this vantage point, a different view of the world can be constructed that locates the study and conceptualization of the home and family in a framework that enables the embedded and interconnected relationship between the family and the home to be more accurately seen and understood. As an organizing principle of the program, the home is seen as a household, dwelling place, and environment wherein the individuals and families living in it are embedded or nested and interconnected.

The home as an organizing principle and a central focus for the family and its study, is explicitly designed to establish the conceptual and stabilizing importance of the home as a unique environment characterized by particularistic and shared meanings, functions, rituals, services, transactions, rituals, and temporal patterns. This emphasis acknowledges that much of home living is organized and conceptualized differently when the home and not the school or workplace is the major context for conceptualizing the study of the everyday life and the family.

Underlying this focus on the home and family is an emphasis on the importance of services provided in homes and families that are usually devalued, taken for granted, and not seen by others unless the work is not done or the services are not provided as expected. Such services are usually performed in homes and families by individuals (usually women) having the primary or sole responsibilities for nurturing and caring for others. In many homes and families, the individual who performs these services and provides the family with its major source of income

are the same individual. This emphasis is designed to help people learn to recognize, value, and understand the central place of these otherwise "invisible" services to maintaining meaningful relationships, insuring continuity in the lives of those served, and providing for meaningful and caregiving activities in the home, family, and community. These services and how they are provided by those who render them are made visible in a representative and legitimate view of the world only if the services become the central organizing principle for that world view. Such a view for studying the home and family and the environments in which they are embedded does not currently exist in the academic community.

Smith describes the everyday world as seen through this view in the following summary:

> The housewife...becomes rather highly skilled at holding together and coordinating the threads and shreds of several lines of action, the projects of more than one individual, while herself pursuing none....What is required is a subordination of attentiveness to self and a focus on others, the lack of development of an independent project organizing relevances and, in contrast, an openness and attentiveness to cues and indications of others' needs. A housewife, holding in place the simultaneous and divergent schedules and activities of a family, depends upon a diffuse and open organization of consciousness available to the various strands, which are coordinated only in her head and by her work and do not coordinate otherwise in the world. And again, we who have done both or do both types of work [home/ family and employment] can report on how the individually undertaken project of our work seriously impair and disorganize our ability to sustain the modes of consciousness required for a peak performance in the role of housewife. (1979, pp. 151-152)

The locus of this world view is the position of individuals who see themselves inseparably connected in relations with others who

engage their world of experience with creating, preserving, caring, and nurturing as their primary values. In this view of the world, living is typified by interruption, discontinuity, lack of completion, and a constant juggling of attention to other individuals and their different needs, schedules, activities, and preferences. It is carried out in a different mode of organizing consciousness. Ontologically I believe we would find that the individual taking such responsibility for caregiving would have a categorically different view of the world. Such a world view and ontology still remains out of the conversation in the present. In these contexts of interaction and shared meaning, home and family resource management are reconceptualized more fittingly as the orchestration of homemaking. This conceptualization and synthesis of the home and family makes it possible, using a different perspective, to educate women and men about their interdependence and connectedness with others, their capabilities for providing services for one another, and several important ways in which they see aspects of the home differently.

In Reclaiming a conversation: The ideal of the educated woman, Jane Roland Martin (1985) argues that education must be "gender-sensitive" (p. 195) instead of gender-related. Education is embedded in productive activities of the public sphere and is totally ignorant of reproductive activities. There are very few discussions that combine the reproductive and productive or the private and public to show how they are almost always present in tandem. Education (including home economics) needs "to raise to

consciousness the hidden curriculum of schooling: its denigration of women and the tasks, traits, and functions our culture associates with them." The new and ever increasing scholarship on women must be integrated into all education curriculums. "Such efforts must be undertaken at all levels of schooling, for it is too little, too late, too elitist to postpone until the college years the revelations of the new research. Another essential step is to build nurturing capacities and an ethics of care into the curriculum itself (p.197)". These and other elements can combine to "enable us to discern ways to bring educational practice into tune with the full range of people's lives and with the present perils to life on earth (p. 199)".

We are at a time when all fields concerned about the family are having some kind of identity and definitional crisis. I believe this is a good time for home economics to lay claim to a wider range of territorial issues that can be organized around their potentially different ontological and epistemological world views. There is much to claim and reframe. But it ought to be done by a scholarly discipline that can look at and organize the world in a different way. One that will create a knowledge base reflecting that unique view. And finally, one that will take the responsibility to enter the knowledge and scholarship into future conversations with other scholars across many other disciplines. I most certainly believe it is possible for home economics to accomplish this--if they are willing to pay the price of good scholarship--to publish and be informed conversationalists.

REFERENCES

Bolen, J. S. (1984). Goddesses in everywoman: A new psychology of women. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Bovy, B. (1984). Feminist research: Implications for home economics education. In P. J. Thompson (Ed.), Home economics teacher education: Knowledge, technology, and family change, Yearbook 4. Bloomington, IL: Teacher Education Section, American Home Economics Association, 293-316.

Costantakos, C. M. (1984). The home economics idea: An etymological odyssey. In P. J. Thompson (Ed.), Home economics teacher education: Knowledge, technology, and family change, Yearbook 4. Bloomington, IL: Teacher Education Section, American Home Economics Association, 176-194.

Gould, C. C. (Ed.), (1984). Beyond domination: New perspectives on women and philosophy. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.

Harding, S. (1985). Book review, Reclaiming a conversation: The ideal of the educated woman. Journal of Education, 167, 124-129.

Harding, S., & Hintikka, M. B. (Eds.), (1983). Discovering reality: Feminist perspectives on epistemology, metaphysics, methodology, and philosophy of science. Boston: D. Reidel.

Martin, J. R. (1985). Reclaiming a conversation: The ideal of the educated woman. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Merrell, R. H., Hoye, S. A., & Thompson, P. J. (1984). Home economics, feminism, and the family. In P. J. Thompson (Ed.), Home economics teacher education: Knowledge, technology, and family change, Yearbook 4. Bloomington, IL: Teacher Education Section, American Home Economics Association, 265-292.

Rabuzzi, K. A. (1982). The sacred and the feminine: Towards a theology of housework. New York: The Seabury Press.

Smith, D. E. (1981). The experienced world as problematic: A feminist method. University of Saskatchewan Sorokin Lectures, No. 12, January 28, 1981. Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan.

Smith, D. E. (1979). A sociology for women. In J. A. Sherman & E. T. Beck (Eds.), The prism of sex: Essays in the sociology of knowledge. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 135-187.

Solomon, B. M. (1985). In the company of educated women: A history of women and higher education. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Thompson, P. J. (1986). Home economics and the Hestian Mode. Illinois Teacher, 29, 87-91.

Thompson, P. J. (1984). Home economics: A knowledge system--not a gender system. In P. J. Thompson (Ed.), Home economics teacher education: Knowledge, technology, and family change, Yearbook 4. Bloomington, IL: Teacher Education Section, American Home Economics Association, 317-341.

Thompson-Tetreault, M. K. (1985). Feminist phase theory: An Experience-derived evaluation model. Journal of Higher Education, 56, 363-384.

Whitbeck, C. (1984). A different reality: Feminist ontology. In C. C. Gould (Ed.), Beyond domination: New perspectives on women and philosophy. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld, 64-88.

APPENDIX A

AREAS FOR FURTHER CONVERSATION WITH HOME ECONOMISTS

WOMEN'S SCHOLARSHIP IN ACADEME: DuBois, E. C., Kelly, G. P., Kennedy, E. L., Korsmeyer, C. W., & Robinson, L. S. Feminist scholarship: Kindling in the groves of academe. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1985.

Thompson-Tetreault, M. K. Feminist phase theory: An Experience derived evaluation model. Journal of Higher Education, 56, 363-384.

FEMINIST ONTOLOGY--CONNECTION OF SELF WITH OTHER: Whitbeck, C. A different reality: Feminist ontology. In C. C. Gould (Ed.), Beyond domination: New perspectives on women and philosophy. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld, 1984, 64-88.

FEMINIST ETHICS: Andolsen, B. H., Gudorf, C. E., & Pellauer, M. D. (Eds.). Women's consciousness, women's conscience: A reader in feminist ethics. Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, 1985.

Noddings, N. Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Robb, C. S. Beverly Wildung Harrison, Making the connections: Essays in feminist social ethics. Boston: Beacon Press, 1985.

FEMINIST EPISTEMOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY: Harding, S., & Hintikka, M. B. (Eds.). Discovering reality: Feminist perspectives on epistemology, metaphysics, methodology, and philosophy of science. Boston: D. Reidel, 1983.

Jaggar, A. M. Feminist politics and human nature. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld, 1983.

Nicholson, L. Feminist theory: The private and the public. In C. C. Gould (Ed.), Beyond domination: New perspectives on women and philosophy. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld, 1984, 221-230.

PHILOSOPHY OF MOTHERING: Rich, A. Of woman born: Motherhood as experience and institution. New York: W. W. Norton, 1976.

Ruddick, S. Maternal thinking. Feminist Studies, 1980, 6, 343-367.

Trebilcot, J. (Ed.). Mothering: Essays in Feminist Theory. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld, 1984.

Whitbeck, C. The maternal instinct. The Philosophical Forum, 1974-1975 6, 265-273.

Whitbeck, C. "Afterword to" the maternal instinct (1982). In Joyce Trebilcot (Ed.). Mothering: Essays in Feminist Theory. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld, 1984, 192-198.

PHILOSOPHY OF PREGNANCY, CHILDBIRTH, AND NEWBORNS: Whitbeck, C. The moral implications of regarding women as people: New perspectives on pregnancy and personhood. In W. B. Bondeson, H. T. Engelhardt, Jr., S. F. Spicker, & D. Winship (Eds.). Abortion and the status of the fetus. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel, 1984, 247-272.

SOCIOLOGY OF THE EVERYDAY WORLD OF WOMEN: Smith, D. E. A sociology for women. In J. A. Sherman & E. T. Beck (Eds.), The prism of sex: Essays in the sociology of knowledge. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1979, 135-187.

INTERRUPTION IN EVERYDAY LIFE: Olsen, T. Silences. New York: Dell, 1978.

TEXTS OF EVERYDAY LIFE: Luxton, M. More than a labour of love: Three generations of women's work in the home. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Women's Educational Press, 1980.

CONFLICTS IN HOUSEWORK AND CHILD CARE: Olson, J. T. Role conflict between housework and child care. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 1979, 6, 430-456.

COMPARING HOME MANAGEMENT, HOUSEKEEPING, & HOMEMAKING: Bernard, J. Policy and women's time. In J. Lipman-Blumen & J. Bernard (Eds.), Sex roles and social policy: A complex social science equation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1979, 303-333.

CONTRASTING HOME AND MARKET ECONOMIES: Vickery-Brown, C. Home production for use in a market economy. In B. Thorne (Ed.), Rethinking the family: Some feminist questions. New York: Longman, 1982, 151-167.

MEANING OF HOME: Altman, I., & Werner, C. (Eds.). Home environments: Human behavior and environment, (Vol. 8). New York: Plenum, 1985.

Holahan, C. J. Sex differences in schematizing the behavioral environment (Chap. 8) from Environment and behavior: A dynamic perspective. New York: Plenum, 1978, 131-139.

Saegert, S., & Winkel, G. The home: A critical problem for changing sex roles. In G. R. Wekerle, R. Peterson, & D. Morley (Eds.), New space for women. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1980, 41-63.

DIFFERING VIEWS OF TIME: Cottle, T. J. Perceiving time: A psychological investigation with men and women. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1976.

Hall, E. T. The dance of life: The other dimension of time. New York: Anchor, 1984.

Table 1

Representative Home Economics Publications Listed in Related Citation and Index Services

	HOME ECONOMICS RESEARCH JOURNAL	ILLINOIS TEACHER OF HOME ECONOMICS	JOURNAL OF CONSUMER STUDIES AND HOME ECONOMICS	JOURNAL OF HOME ECONOMICS	JOURNAL OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RESEARCH	JOURNAL OF VOCATIONAL HOME ECON EDUCATION	TOTALS
CHILD DEVELOPMENT ABST AND BIBLIOGRAPHY	*						1
EDUCATION INDEX		*		*	*		3
HUMAN RESOURCES ABST				*			1
SAGE FAMILY STUDIES ABSTRACTS				*			1
STUDIES ON WOMEN ABSTRACTS			*				1
WOMEN STUDIES ABST							0
PSYCHOLOGICAL ABST							0
SOCIOLOGICAL ABST							0
SOCIAL SCIENCES INDEX							0
SOCIAL SCIENCES CITATION INDEX							0
CURRENT CONTENTS: SOC & BEHAV SCI							0
TOTALS	1	1	1	3	1	0	7

Table 2

An Evaluation Model of Feminist Phase Theory[1]

1. MALE SCHOLARSHIP The absence of women is not noted. There is no consciousness that the male experience is "particular knowledge" selected from a wider universe of possible knowledge and experience. It is valued, emphasized, and viewed as the knowledge most worth having.

2. COMPENSATORY SCHOLARSHIP The absence of women is noted. There is a search for missing women according to the male norm of greatness, excellence, or humanness. Women are considered as exceptional, deviant, or "other". Women are added into the traditional structure of the discipline but the structure and methodology are not challenged.

3. BIFOCAL SCHOLARSHIP Human experience is conceptualized primarily in dualist categories: male and female; private and public; agency and communion; productive and reproductive. Emphasis is on a "complementary but equal" conceptualization of men's and women's spheres and personal qualities. There is a focus on women's oppression and misogyny. Women's efforts to overcome that oppression are presented. Efforts to include women lead to the insight that the traditional content, structure, and methodology of the disciplines are more appropriate to the male experience.

4. FEMINIST SCHOLARSHIP Scholarly inquiry pursues new questions, new categories, and new notions of significance which illuminate women's traditions, history, culture, values, visions, and perspectives. A pluralistic conception of women emerges which acknowledges diversity and recognizes that other variables besides gender shape women's lives; for example, race, ethnicity, and social class. Efforts are made to reconceptualize knowledge to encompass the female experience.

5. MULTIFOCAL, RELATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP A multifocal, gender balanced perspective is sought which serves to fuse women's and men's experiences into a holistic view of human experience. At this stage, scholars are conscious of particularity, while at the same time identifying common denominators of experience. They begin to define what binds together and what separates the various segments of humanity.

[1]Source: Adapted from Thompson-Tetreault, 1985, pp. 368-372.